

42390P12945

**Remarks**

Reconsideration of this application is requested. This response is to the Office Action dated August 30, 2006, and a listing of claims 1-26 that remain in the application is included in this amendment.

**Response to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-11, 21-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cupps et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0173344).

**Claims 1-11**

FIGs. 1, 2 and 3 in the U.S. 2002/0173344 A1 publication were cited by the Examiner as 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior art to form the basis for the rejections of Applicant's claims 1-11, 21-24 and 26. Although FIGs. 1 and 2 describe a cellular telephone module and a PCS Phone module attached to a processing device, Cupps et al. does not provide enough detail about the devices and their connections to anticipate Applicant's claims. However, Cupps et al. does provide considerable details about FIG. 3 and the other figures that will be addressed as concerning Applicant's claims.

Cupps et al. illustrate three processors in FIG. 3, namely PC processor 320, system processor 302 and DSP 303. Applicant's claim 1 recites a host processor that has an active state that allows a user to specify a policy. Cupps et al. do teach in paragraph [0034] that certain tasks are performed by System Processor 302 rather than Computer Processor 320. These tasks include the control of Telephone Module 390, controlling Display 307, interfacing with Touch screen 309 and Display Controller 308, as well as interfacing with Memory Devices 310 and 311 during operation of Telephone Module 390. System Processor 302 interfaces with the touch screen to receive user inputs and may be the closest to the host processor as recited in Applicant's claim 1, but Applicants allow for System Processor 320 to be the host processor.

Applicant's claim 1 also recites that the host processor has an active state that allows a user to specify a policy, and an inactive state where the host processor is inoperative to user inputs. In paragraph [0040] Cupps et al. teach that System Processor 302 serves as an overall power manager to determine

42390P12945

when Processor 320 will be on and when it will be in its sleep mode. It is clear that Cupps et al. teach that Processor 320 has an active state and an inactive state, i.e., a sleep mode, as controlled by System Processor 302 but it is not clear that System Processor 302 is powered down.

Applicant's claim 1 further recites a device coupled to the host processor to transmit and receive Radio Frequency (RF) signals in accordance with the policy when the host processor is in the inactive state. In paragraph [0034] Cupps et al. teach that System Processor 302 performs additional features suited to its level of computational ability and its low power requirements, such as interfacing with hardware elements contained within Accessories Module 371. Such operations include a Wireless LAN mobile 802.11 device and operation of a Bluetooth device. Also Cupps et al. teach in paragraph [0029] that System Processor 302 controls Telephone Module 390, which serves to provide cellular telephone communications and is capable of handling contact management, scheduling, and e-mail tasks. Thus, it is clear that System Processor 302 as taught by Cupps et al. is coupled to a device to transmit and receive RF signals. Applicants believe that System Processor 302 provides the features of interfacing user information and interfacing RF modules, and therefore, System Processor 302 is considered the "host processor" as found in Applicant's claim 1.

However, Cupps et al. do not anticipate several features of Applicant's claim 1. Applicant provides in claim 1 that a host processor allows a user to specify a policy that is used by a device to transmit and receive RF signals and that the device has access to the policy while the host processor is in an inactive state. Specific to these differences, Cupps et al. teach in paragraph [0027] that the present invention may be thought of as a Personal Computer (PC) and a cellular telephone, each having very different power requirements. The overall system level power management strategy allows processor 320 to either be turned off completely or put into a deep sleep mode any time that the more robust PC functionality is not absolutely needed. While it is clear that processor 320 has an active and inactive state, it is not clear that system processor 302 has the active and inactive states.

42390P12945

Cupps et al. do not teach that System Processor 302, i.e., the host processor, has an active mode and an inactive mode and the information provided is not sufficient to determine that a device transmits and receives Radio Frequency (RF) signals in accordance with the policy previously specified while the host processor is in the inactive state. Accordingly, the relied upon art cannot anticipate Applicants' claim 1. Claims 2-11 depend, either directly or indirectly, from base claim 1 and are believed allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as base claim 1.

**Claims 21-24 and 26**

Applicants' claim 21 recites: updating a policy using a processor in a powered state; downloading the policy to a device; placing the processor in an inactive state; and using the device to transmit and receive Radio Frequency (RF) signals according to the policy even when the processor is in the inactive state.

As previously mentioned, Cupps et al. do not teach updating a policy using a processor in a powered state and using a device that capable of transmitting and receiving RF signals according to the policy even when the processor is in the inactive state. Thus, it is believed that claim 21 overcomes the relied upon art and the Cupps et al. reference does not anticipate Applicants' claim 21. Claims 22-24 and claim 26 depend from base claim 21 and are believed to be allowable over the prior art of reference for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

**Response to the 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection**

The Office Action rejects claims 12-20 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cupps et al. in view of Mizoguchi et al.

**Claims 12-16**

Applicant's claim 12 recites a host processor having an active state to generate a policy and an inactive state where the host processor is not responsive to user inputs; and an RF device attached to a card to insert into a slot of the portable system, wherein the RF device after insertion into the slot is coupled to the host processor to receive the policy and transmit and receive

42390P12945

Radio Frequency (RF) signals in accordance with the policy when the host processor is in the inactive state.

The Examiner relies on the Mizoguchi et al. reference to show a portable apparatus that may be connected to RF device services in combination with a host processor device.

Applicant still maintains that the Cupps et al. reference, even in combination with the Mizoguchi et al. reference, is deficient to show all features and limitations of Applicant's claim 12. Namely, it is believed that System Processor 302 is capable to receive user inputs about a policy as taught by Cupps et al., but it has not been taught by either reference that a device transmits and receives RF signals in accordance with the policy when the host processor is in the inactive state. In other words, it just is not clear that System Processor 302 is placed in an inactive mode, and further, it is not clear that RF device has access to the policy even if the host processor was placed in an inactive mode.

Claims 13-16 depend, either directly or indirectly, from base claim 12 and are believed to be allowable based on claim 12 being allowable.

**Claims 17-20**

Applicant's claim 17 recites a portable computer having a host processor, comprising an RF device to request data in accordance with a policy that stores user-defined services in preparation of a command from the host processor to request the user-defined services, wherein the RF device provides wireless transmission even when the host processor is in an inactive state.

The Cupps et al. reference, even in combination with the Mizoguchi et al. reference, do not show that an RF device requests data in accordance with a policy that stores user-defined services in preparation of a command from the host processor to request the user-defined services, wherein the RF device provides wireless transmission even when the host processor is in an inactive state.

Again, Applicant does not believe that the host processor as taught by Cupps et al. shows the RF device providing wireless transmission even when the host processor is in an inactive state. Claims 18-20 depend, either directly

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 08 2007

42390P12945

or indirectly, from base claim 17 and are believed to be allowable based on claim 17 being allowable.

**Claim 25**

Applicants' claim 25 depends from Applicants' claim 21 and is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as base claim 21 being allowable.

**Conclusion**

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed August 30, 2006, and reconsideration of the rejections is requested. It is submitted that claims 1-26 are now in condition for allowance and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Applicants herewith petition the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to extend the time for response to the Office Action dated August 30, 2006, for 3 months. Please charge Deposit Account #50-0221 in the amount of \$1020.00 for a three month extension. Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #50-0221.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (480) 715-5388 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Benjamin K. Gibbs

/Lanny L. Parker/

Lanny L. Parker  
Patent Agent  
Reg. No. 44,281

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd., Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 264-0967